UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,114	09/08/2003	Yoshifumi Tanimoto	031004	7054

38834   7590   05/14/2008
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER
ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/656,114	TANIMOTO, YOSHIFUMI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID E. ENGLAND	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _13 March 2008_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-13_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-13_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 13 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   **Claims 1, 3, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Murata, (Japanese Publication number 2001-186301) in view of Parsons.et al,

hereinafter referred to as Parsons (US patent 7031437).

4.   Regarding claims 1, 3, and 12:

5.   A communication terminal device and method comprising:

means for accepting a screen file for displaying a configuration screen having a configuration

data entry field (paragraph 0013 discloses an HTML file which shows the configuration setting

information with an input screen); means for accepting configuration data for setting the

prescribed apparatus in the configuration data entry field (paragraph 001 discloses a fax machine

whose device settings can be changed remotely using a browser, in which the means, data entry

field, and accepting unit which is the client all of which are additionally implied by these

functions which are performed); means for accepting information for specifying the prescribed

apparatus intended to set the configuration data, as destination identification information (Since

in paragraph 0005, the device settings are changed from a browser on the client, the device must

have been specified and identified, and the unit to do this is the browser on the client, with the

prescribed apparatus being the fax); and means for transmitting the configuration data directly to

the prescribed apparatus specified by the destination identification information (paragraph 0005

discloses a client, which inherently has transmitting means, using a browser to change the device

settings which must have been specified with a destination identification information in order to

be sent from the client to the prescribed apparatus).

6.   Murata discloses all the limitations as disclosed above except for from a means for

storing data other than a prescribed apparatus and from other than a prescribed apparatus.

7.   Parsons discloses from a means for storing data other than a prescribed apparatus,

configuring an apparatus from other than the prescribed apparatus, and accepting a screen file

from other than the prescribed apparatus. (Col 5, lines 57-65 discloses "It should be noted that

the user may configure more than one device for receiving alerts, in which case the notification

server 202 should include user interface functionality (e.g. an HTTP server for communicating

with a user's browser via the LAN 108 or the Internet) for dynamically configuring or changing

configurations of devices, and for allowing the user to select between the different devices, as

well as the user's current indication of whether to receive alerts via any of the devices." The

browser client is referred to as: "e.g. a PC, laptop, handheld or other wired device having

browser functionality for communicating with remote devices using conventional protocols such

as HT-IP via the Internet." Col 4, lines 1-6. The prescribed apparatuses are wireless devices such

as "one-way and two-way pagers, cell phones and PDAs." Col 4, lines 9- 10).

8.   The general concept of storing information such as a web page on a server to configure a device through a client browser is well known in the art as illustrated by Parsons who discloses a configuration system involving networked apparatuses which has means for storing data in other than a prescribed apparatus and configuring and accepting screen files from other than a prescribed apparatus.

9.   It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Murata to include the use of storing data other than a prescribed apparatus, configuring an apparatus from other than the prescribed apparatus, and accepting a screen file from other than the prescribed apparatus in his advantageous method as taught by Parsons in order to conveniently configure devices with limited memory such as pagers and cell phones, with the use of a centralized server.

10.   Murata and Parsons disclose the communication terminal device according to claim 3, wherein the destination accepting unit accepts an entry of a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) which can be acquired by the prescribed apparatus, and the transmission unit transmits the configuration data to the URL (paragraph 0006 discloses transmitting the device setting information displayed on a browser which has a URL and paragraph 0037 discloses the "MFT" or multi functional peripheral device, reads the configuration data based on the specified URL).

11.   **Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (JP publication number 2001-186301), and Parsons as applied to claim 1 and 3 and further in view of Bates et al (US patent number 6963901), hereinafter referred to as Bates.**

12.   Regarding claims 2 and 9:

13.   Murata and Parsons disclose all the limitations except for wherein the means for accepting the destination identification information accepts an entry of an electronic mail address of an electronic mail message which can be acquired by the prescribed apparatus, and the means for transmitting transmits the electronic mail message including the configuration data to the electronic mail address.

14.   Bates teaches using email messages to transmit configuration data. (Bates discloses in Column 9, line 55-57 that an email message is transmitted that includes configuration information for a prescribed apparatus, which in Bate's invention is a browser program, and the email address is designated in the message, which is sent to the browser program, line 54, Column 9).

15.   The general concept of providing email messages to provide configuration data is well known in the art as illustrated by Bates who discloses using email messages in a configuration method and apparatus.

16.   It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Murata of his to include the use of an email message and address in his advantageous method as taught by Bates in order to "facilitate the configuration" as stated by Bates in Column 1, line 58.

17.   **Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (JP publication number 2001-186301) and Parsons as applied to claims 1, 3 and 12 and further in view of Weghorst et al (US patent 6775559 B1), hereinafter referred to as Weghorst.**

18.   Regarding claims 4 and 13:

19.   Murata and Parsons disclose all the limitations of claims 4 and 13 except for:

20.   a confirmation screen generation unit, which generates a confirmation screen for confirming the configuration data and/or the destination identification information • accepted by the configuration data accepting unit and/or the destination accepting unit.

21.   Weghorst teaches a confirmation screen sent as a message to confirm the configuration data. (Weghorst uses a short message service that is sent as a screen file in text, which includes a checksum, which is used for configuration data confirmation, in addition to the configuration data. Column 3, paragraphs 1, 2, and 4).

22.   The general concept of providing a confirmation screen for confirming configuration data

is well known in the art as illustrated by Weghorst who discloses a confirmation generation in a

configuration method.

23.   It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Murata to include the use of a confirmation screen in his advantageous method as

taught by Weghorst in order to provide for the "setting of the...parameters can also be

accomplished in a remote-controlled manner" as stated by Weghorst in his abstract, last three of

four lines.

24.   **Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Murata (JP publication number 2001-186301) and Parsons as applied to claims 1 and 3,

and further in view of Kley (US patent 6947977).

25.   Regarding claim 5:

26.   Murata and Parsons discloses all the limitations of claim 5 except for wherein the screen

file accepting unit accepts the screen file from a remote recording medium.

27.   Kley teaches using a web server to send a screen file to a client, or screen file accepting

unit. (Kley discloses a web server which provides screen files to a user unit which accepts the

screen file and in which the web server inherently has RAM which is a recording medium,

Column 1, lines 40-49).

28.   The general concept of providing a remote recording medium to send a screen file is well

known in the art as illustrated by Kley who discloses a Web server in a system which sends

screen files to clients to perform configuration of service requests (Column1, lines 43-46).

29.   It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Murata to include the use of a remote recording medium in his advantageous method

as taught by Kley in order to communicate web pages requested by the clients back to the

requesting client systems as stated by Kley in Column 2, lines 4-5.

30.   Regarding claim 6:

31.   Murata discloses all the limitations except for wherein the screen file

accepting unit accepts the screen file from other than the prescribed apparatus via a

communication network.

32.   Parsons teaches accepting the screen file from other than the prescribed apparatus via a

communication network. (Col 5, lines 57-65 discloses "It should be noted that the user may

configure more than one device for receiving alerts, in which case the notification server 202

should include user interface functionality (e.g. an HTTP server for communicating with a user's

browser via the LAN 108 or the Internet) for dynamically configuring or changing

configurations of devices, and for allowing the user to select between the different devices, as

well as the user's current indication of whether to receive alerts via any of the devices." The

browser client is referred to as: "e.g. a PC, laptop, handheld or other wired device having

browser functionality for communicating with remote devices using conventional protocols such

as HTTP via the Internet." Col 4, lines 1-6. The prescribed apparatuses are wireless devices such

as "one-way and two-way pagers, cell phones and PDAs." Col 4, lines 9- 10).

33.   The general concept of providing accepting the screen file from other than the prescribed

apparatus via a communication network is well known in the art as illustrated by Parsons which

discloses accepting the screen file from other than the prescribed apparatus via a communication

network. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Murata of his advantageous method as taught by Parsons in order to

conveniently configure devices with limited memory such as pagers and cell phones, with the

use of a centralized server.

34.   Kley teaches using a network (title) which sends screen files from a web server to a

communication device (Key discloses a web server, which store information provides screen

files to a user accepting unit, the client computer, which accepts the file and uses a

communication network Column 1, lines 40-49).

35.   The general concept of providing a way to send a screen file via a communication

network is well known in the art as illustrated by Kley who discloses a Web server in a system

which sends screen files to clients to perform configuration of service requests (Column1, lines

43-46).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify Murata to include the use of a remote recording medium in his advantageous method as

taught by Kley in order to communicate web pages requested by the clients back to the

requesting client systems as stated by Kley in Column 2, lines 4-5.

36.   **Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata and
Parsons as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Harvey (US patent 7054924).**

37.   Regarding claim 7:

Murata and Parsons disclose all the limitations of claim 7 except for wherein the screen file

includes a default value in the confguration data entry field. (Harvey discloses a screen file in

Figure 4 and discloses that "the default IP address value is 0.0.0.0. which means the user must

enter a value. Column 12, lines 55-57).

38.   The general concept of providing a default value for a configuration method and

apparatus is well known in the art as illustrated by Harvey who discloses a default value in a

configuration data entry field.

39.   It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Murata to include the use of a default value in his advantageous method as taught by

Harvey in order to provide for "carrying out network device...configuration, and communication

of other information to a network device, automatically and in an assured manner" as stated by

Harvey in his abstract, lines 1-4.

40.   **Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (JP**

publication number 2001-186301) and Parsons as applied to claim 3 and further in view of

Fields et al (US patent 6412008 B1).

41.   Regarding claim 8:

42.   Murata and Parsons disclose all the limitations of claim 8 except for: a user specifying

unit which specifies a user; and a customize unit which customizes the screen file in accordance

with a result of the specification.

43.   Fields teaches customizing screen files after specification of the user. (When the client

requests the screen file, the server determines the user characteristics to customize the screen file.

Abstract, lines 3-6 and 9-11, and title).

44.   The general concept of customizing a screen file according to user characteristics is well

known in the art as illustrated by Fields who discloses screen file customization in a screen file

method and system.

45.   It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Murata to include the use of customization based on user o information in his

advantageous method as taught by Fields in order to customize and display a network file as

stated by Fields in his abstract, lines 1-2.

46.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata and

Parsons as applied to claim 3, in view of Bates, as applied to claim 9, and further in view of

Harrison (US patent number 6434502).

47.   Regarding claim 10:

48.   Murata and Parsons disclose all the limitations of claim 10 except for wherein the

electronic mail address is an electronic mail address exclusive for maintenance.

49.   Bates discloses that an email message is used for re-configuring, thus. using an email

address for maintenance, title, and abstract, last two lines.

50.   The general concept of providing an email address for maintenance of configuration is

well known in the art as illustrated by Bates who discloses an email message with an address in a

reconfiguration method and apparatus.

51.   It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Bates to inciude the use of an email address for configuration maintenance in his

advantageous method as taught by Bates in order to "facilitate the configuration" as stated by

Bates in Column 1, line 59.

52.   Harrison teaches using a dedicated email address for updating information. (Harrison

discloses using a dedicated or exclusive email address for the updating of information, Column

1, line 51-51, and Column 1, lines 8-9.)

53.   The general concept of providing an exclusive email address is well known in the art as

illustrated by Harrison who discloses a dedicated email address in an information updating

system.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify Murata to include the use of an exclusive email address in his advantageous method as

taught by Harrison in order to "send update.., information" as stated by Harrison in his abstract,

diagram block 80.

Response to Arguments

54.   Applicant's arguments filed 03/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

55.   In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that the prior art of Parsons does not teach

that the devices are directly configured by the browser access.

56.   As to this remark, Applicant is asked to look at the rejection above for Murata is utilized

to teach this limitation not Parsons.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID E. ENGLAND whose telephone number is (571)272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David E. England
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2143

/David E. England/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2143